DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 259 059 UD 024 332

TITLE Report No. 5 to the United States District Court, District of Massachusetts on Boston School Desegregation, Volume I.

INSTITUTION Massachusetts State Dept. of Education, Boston. Bureau of Operational Support.

PUB DATE 15 Jul 85

NOTE 40p.; For Volume II, see UD 024 333. For earlier reports, see ED 248 279-281 and ED 253 628-629.

PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Bilingual Education; *Compliance (Legal); Desegregation Effects; Desegregation Methods; *Desegregation Plans; Educational Facilities; Elementary Secondary Education; Enrollment; Magnet Schools; Minority Groups; Parent Associations; Parent School Relationship; Program Implementation; Racial Integration; School Demography; *School Desegregation; School Personnel; Social Services; Student Organizations; Student Placement; Student Transportation; Vocational Education

IDENTIFIERS *Boston Public Schools MA; Monitoring

ABSTRACT

Desegregation efforts made by the Boston Public School District between December, 1984, and May, 1985, are described and assessed in this executive summary of a monitoring report prepared for the U.S. District Court. Following a brief overview, separate sections deal with the following seven monitoring areas: student assignments, special desegregation measures, vocational/occupational education, facilities, staff, transportation, and parent and student organizations. Throughout this summary, emphasis is placed on the compliance status of outstanding court orders, and suggestions are made for a future monitoring process. The summary concludes with a brief discussion of disputes and modifications accepted during the year of study. (KH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED259059

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
BOARD OF EDUCATION

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

REPORT NO. 5

TO THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS ON BOSTON SCHOOL DESEGREGATION VOLUME 1 JULY 15, 1985

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. D. Bella

Mass. State Dept. of Ed.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

UD024332

MASSACHUSETTS BOARD OF EDUCATION

Ms. Mary Ellen Smith, Boston, *Chairperson*
Mrs. Mary C. Wright, Falmouth, *Vice Chairperson*

Mr. Christopher H. Collins, Millis
Mr. Robert A. Farmer, Brookline
Mrs. Anne C. Fox, Needham
Rev. Paul V. Garrity, Malden
Ms. Milca R. Gonzalez, Worcester
Mr. James R. Grande, Hanover
Mr. Howard A. Greis, Holden
Mrs. Loretta L. Roach, Boston
Mr. Joseph C. Savery, Lee
Mrs. Dorothea A. Zanetti, Wilbraham

Dr. John H. Lawson, *Commissioner of Education, Secretary*

Mr. John B. Duff, *Chancellor*, Board of Regents, Ex Officio

Report Coordinated by—
Franklin Banks, *Special Assistant to the Commissioner on Boston Desegregation*

Joel Lidz, *Editing, Proofreading*

Produced by the Bureau of Operational Support
Cecilia DiBella, *Director*
Susan Gardner, *Publications/Communications Coordinator*
Susan M. Ridge, *Typographist*

The Massachusetts Department of Education insures equal employment/educational opportunities/affirmative action regardless of race, color, creed, national origin or sex, in compliance with Title IX, or handicap, in compliance with section 504.

PUBLICATION OF THIS DOCUMENT APPROVED BY DANIEL D. CARTER, STATE PURCHASING AGENT.

750-6-85-804091

Est. Cost Per Copy $.97

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
BOARD OF EDUCATION

REPORT NO. 5

TO THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

ON

BOSTON SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

VOLUME I

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page No.
	OVERVIEW	1
I.	MONITORING REPORTS	
	Student Assignments and Special Desegregation Measures	7
	Vocational and Occupational Education	19
	School Facilities	25
	Staff	29
	Transportation (including school bus safety)	31
	Parent and Student Organizations	33
II.	DISPUTE RESOLUTIONS	37
III.	MODIFICATIONS	39

OVERVIEW

This is the Fifth Monitoring Report on Boston Public School Desegregation filed by the Massachusetts Board of Education and Commissioner of Education under the Orders of Disengagement entered by Federal District Court Judge W. Arthur Garrity, Jr. on December 23, 1982. The report covers Boston Public School operations from December 1984 through May 1985, and is based upon data collected by Massachusetts Department of Education monitors during this period.

A number of factors in addition to the usual time constraints presented impediments to our data collection effort during this monitoring period. Ongoing negotiations among the parties concerning critical unresolved issues, and the anticipation of certain Court orders, left the findings and conclusions in several monitoring areas subject to last minute revision. In addition, John R. Coakley, who in his role as Boston's Senior Officer for Implementation has both directed the processing of student assignments and served as primary liaison to the Department of Education, was hospitalized during the month of April. Given these circumstances, an extra measure of appreciation must be expressed for the assistance provided by Superintendent Robert Spillane and members of the Boston School Department, and in particular to Catherine Ellison and her staff at the Department of Implementation.

The format of the present report is similar to that used in Report No. 4, except that the sections on Student Assignments and Special Desegregation Measures have been combined. In addition, the number of monitoring areas has been reduced to seven, the Board and Commissioner of Education having been relieved of monitoring responsibilities (with exceptions, noted below) in the areas of Bilingual Education, School Safety and Security, and Student Discipline by the Court's Further Partial Termination of Jurisdiction, dated May 17, 1985. Our report is once again presented in two volumes, with an executive summary of findings in the seven monitoring areas contained in Volume I, and a more detailed analysis of the findings plus all supporting documentation in Volume II. As in the past, the parenthetical page references in Volume I direct the reader to the supporting materials in Volume II. While Volume II is intended for more

limited distribution than Volume I, a copy of Volume II will again be made available for every school in Boston.

The emphasis on the compliance status of outstanding orders has been retained, given our even greater assurance that the Boston Public Schools are about to enter a new phase in their desegregation effort. The Court's commitment to realize further disengagement at the end of the 1984-85 school year makes this focus on unrealized portions of the desegregation remedy imperative; it also suggests that the time has arrived to consider a revision in the method by which compliance is monitored in the future. The State Board is committed to continuing its oversight in appropriate remedial areas, but favors a more streamlined approach that places greater responsibilities on local officials, particularly in those areas not generally subject to state monitoring (e.g., staffing, parent organizations). For that reason, our summary of monitoring findings in each of the seven areas also contains suggestions for a future monitoring process.

STUDENT ASSIGNMENTS: (Note that this section now includes assignment of bilingual students by Court order.) Assignments for 1985-86 have been processed, reviewed and distributed. The Court approved the consolidation of Districts III and IV on May 30. While a complete analysis of desegregation gains must await data on September enrollments, analysis of student applications indicates potential desegregation improvement at Burke and English High Schools, but a continuing decline in requests for the Humphrey Center and Madison Park High School. Among proposed and adopted assignment modifications, the Recruitment Incentive Plan and the new assignment process used in Districts III and IV show the greatest promise of enhancing desegregation, provided that each is implemented with the necessary support at the school and central office level.

Data provided on bilingual assignments suggests that one-third of middle school bilingual students have been enrolled for six or more years without mainstreaming. The Department of Education is confirming this data with on-site visits to selected Boston schools.

Monitoring of all student assignments, in terms of both the process and the results, should continue under the auspices of the State Board, under its general charge to monitor racial imbalance and desegregation in Massachusetts public schools. The State Board also plans to produce a follow-up study during the fall of 1985 on the transition of bilingual students into regular education programs in Boston and other Massachusetts school districts.

SPECIAL DESEGREGATION MEASURES: Further progress has been observed at Burke High School and the East Boston Business Magnet. The issue of support services at the examination schools remains unresolved, and has been the subject of negotiations among the parties.

The State Board recommends that future monitoring of special desegregation be combined with general student assignment monitoring.

VOCATIONAL/OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION: (Note that this section retains the provision of vocational/occupational education services to bilingual students by Court order.) Once again problems have been identified in several areas, including middle school exploratory clusters, bilingual services and management support. A State Board proposal for modification of the Unified Plan for Vocational and Occupational Education has been the subject of negotiations with School Defendants, Plaintiff-Intervenors and Plaintiffs, and the State Board hopes to forward its proposal to the Court at the time the present monitoring report is filed.

Continued monitoring of vocational/occupational education in Boston should be conducted by the State Board in line with its statewide authority for occupational education. Assignments to vocational programs should continue to be monitored under general student assignment monitoring.

FACILITIES: A Unified Facilities Plan was filed with the Court by the School Department, the City of Boston and the State Board. This filing was rejected by the Court, although leave was given to proceed with the major renovation and repair projects scheduled for the first year of the Plan. The Court also announced its intention to file further orders on facilities but had not done so as of June 10. Further recommendations on monitoring under this area await receipt of the new order.

STAFF: A discrepancy has been noted in the progress made in obtaining the goal of 25% black teachers and administrators, with no appreciable progress in the former category and steady progress in the latter. More commitment to minority teacher recruitment and maintenance is required, as well as a review of the impact of the recall policy provided for under the current collective bargaining agreement.

Monitoring of staff desegregation can continue through periodic reports by the Boston Schools, similar to the reports currently filed under Court orders. These findings should be provided to the State Board and other parties of record.

TRANSPORTATION: (Note that this section now includes transportation safety by Court order.) Boston has yet to respond to issues raised in Reports #3 and 4 regarding management of the transportation system. The School Bus Safety plan implemented last fall, on the other hand, appears to have been successful in reducing the number of incidents occurring on school buses.

The areas of transportation and transportation safety may be monitored in the future through a combination of internal reports generated by the Department of Implementation and additional reports prepared by the Citywide Parents Council. Both types of reports should be provided to the State Board and other parties of record.

PARENT AND STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS: The strengthening of parent and student organizations, either through increased efforts to comply with existing orders or proposals for modification, is still required; although the CPC has been able to address some of its organizational problems. Further strengthening of the CPC requires the creation of a narrower and more specific set of monitoring tasks for the organization, plus a clear recognition by the School Committee and School Department that the CPC is the parent organization responsible for all desegregation-related efforts, together with other mandates of state law where parental input is required. Both School Parent Councils and Racial/Ethnic Student Councils must be either constituted in accordance with present Court orders, or alternative student organization structures must be proposed through the modification process.

The State Board is confident that the monitoring steps proposed above can be achieved by the appropriate parties after final orders have been entered by the Court, and that progress toward completing the desegregation remedy can continue. For its part, the State Board is prepared to pursue those issues that fall under its authority without the direct mandate of the District Court. For example, the transition of students from bilingual to regular education programs, identified as a concern in the Student Assignment section of the present report, is not viewed by the State Board as an issue requiring the ongoing oversight of the Court. This issue will be addressed through

follow-up studies in Boston and other Massachusetts communities, and the State Board will report its findings in the fall of 1985, under its authority to enforce state law. With continued attention to the responsibilities of state and local officials, the disengagement of the Court will not impede further progress toward the realization of a unified school system in Boston.

Mary Ellen Smith
Chairperson, Massachusetts
Board of Education

John H. Lawson
Commissioner, Massachusetts
Department of Education

STUDENT ASSIGNMENTS AND SPECIAL DESEGREGATION MEASURES

I. ASSIGNMENTS

ORDERS Student Desegregation Plan, May 10, 1975

FINDINGS Compliance with respect to Assignment Process

The assignment process took place in accordance with Court-approved procedures, and the various steps (including examination school invitations and assignments to schools) were reviewed and approved. Report No. 3 (Volume II, pages 0-103) contains a description and documentation of this process as it was carried out in 1984.

Review of proposed assignments suggests that there may be some improvement in the number of schools in compliance with the racial/ethnic guidelines (taking into account assignments to bilingual programs). Because of the history of "shrinkage" of white numbers between the assignments and the actual enrollments (see Report No. 3, Volume I, pages 38-39; Report No 2, Volume II, pages 94-98), no attempt will be made to determine overall compliance with Court-established racial/ethnic guidelines until Fall enrollments are available. High school enrollments have been the subject of particular attention, however, and the projections for Fall 1985 will be discussed:

Projected High School Enrollments

English and Madison Park High Schools have come into compliance, though at the lower limit, in projected white enrollment (each is projected to be 20% white, with a permitted range of 20%-30%). To some extent this reflects bilingual program assignments; the white projected enrollment of the two schools would be 24% and 23% white, respectively, without bilingual enrollment.

Report No. 4 noted improvement in compliance with desegregation requirements at English, but some deterioration at Madison Park (Volume I, page 9). Comparison of the first-choice assignment requests made by students entering the ninth grade in 1983 and 1985 shows that requests for English are up in all three racial/ethnic categories, while requests for Madison Park are down in all three categories. This suggests that English High School is "turning around" educationally, and that the merger of the Occupational Resource Center with Madison Park will be confronting formidable barriers in converting two relatively unpopular facilities into a single school.

Burke High School--a special desegregation school--is projected to come into compliance with the permitted racial/ethnic ranges, after several years of impressive effort to create a safe and educationally-sound program, and Dorchester High is projected to remain in compliance after achieving it in 1983-84. Several district high schools--Jamaica Plain, South Boston, Brighton--which were having compliance problems in 1983-84 are projected to be in compliance in 1985-86. Dorchester and South Boston are projected to be high in Other Minority enrollment, but justifiably so as a result of large bilingual programs.

II. SPECIAL DESEGREGATION MEASURES

ORDERS May 3, 1976; May 6, 1977; March 21, 1978; April 20, 1982

FINDINGS Partial Compliance (Improving)

The four elementary and two middle schools for which special desegregation measures have been ordered by the Court are all included among the Recruitment Incentive Plan schools, and will be discussed below; no new monitoring of these schools, or of the Tobin K-8 school, took place in this period.

Report No. 4 found that full compliance had been achieved with the voluntary special desegregation plan for Dorchester High, and no further monitoring took place in this period. Requirements for improved enrollment and staffing of the Spanish bilingual program at Charlestown High had been met, and continue to be met. Two special desegregation schools require further discussion here:

Burke High School

Facility improvements have largely been completed. Efforts to develop distinctive and high-quality educational programs in order to attract students and thus to meet racial/ethnic guidelines have continued, though uncertainty over the School Committee's proposal to make the Burke a city-wide magnet school have reportedly led to an interruption of support from the central administration. (P. 19)

East Boston Business Magnet

The last monitoring report found that the administration of East Boston High School had undertaken promising steps to redress the non-compliance issues identified in earlier reports. These concerned lack of support services for students, and general neglect of the business magnet, which had

resulted in an undistinguished program. However, the report also found that the school administration's efforts were not receiving support from Boston's central administration.

The picture is brighter this spring. Federal vocational education funds have been allocated to the business magnet for the first time and there is a promise of federal funds from Boston's block grant. (PP. 20-26)

III. MODIFICATIONS TO THE STUDENT ASSIGNMENT PLAN

ORDERS February 20, 1985

FINDINGS It must be noted, of each of the measures discussed below, that they were requested by the School Committee and permitted by the Court; to the extent that they have not been implemented, and Boston continues to abide by previous orders of the Court, there is no "non-compliance" cited.

(1) Administrative Consolidation of Districts

Has not yet taken place.

(2) Permission for Kindergarten Students to Anticipate Grade 1 Assignment

The impact of this new assignment provision was negligible.

(3) Guarantee of District High School, on Request

All first-choice requests for the district high school were honored. In most instances fewer students of each racial/ethnic group requested their district high school than were actually assigned to it.

The impact of this new assignment provision was slight.

(4) Madison Park Linked to Humphrey Occupational Resource Center

While this will not be implemented until 1986-87, Boston is taking steps to assure that students will have the necessary information to make sound decisions about whether to apply for a ninth grade assignment to Madison Park/ORC next Spring. All eighth grade students in the system will participate in a one-week exploratory program (see page 19) at the Humprey Center in 1985-86.

(5) Recruitment Incentive Plan (RIP)

Initial preparations to implement this "affirmative action to desegregate" are discussed below. In brief, notice to community district superintendents and affected principals of the opportunity to recruit students went out so late that few efforts took place, except in one district, and specific guidelines on how the RIP will be implemented were not available as of late May. This failure to move vigorously to implement a program which the School Committee urged the Court to accept in December, 1984 may be attributed to (a) the habit of administrators in Boston, at all levels, of leaving "affirmative action to desegregate" entirely in the hands of the Department of Implementation, and (b) the preoccupation of the DI with testing the assignment modification proposed for districts 3 and 4. (PP. 27-42)

(6) Mather and Elihu Greenwood Recruitment

No efforts were made to implement the new provisions for the Greenwood, which will be affected by the district 3 and 4 modifications. Notices were sent to all

parents eligible for new Mather School assignments; 52 Black, 20 White and 12 Other Minority students requested the Mather and were assigned from outside of its attendance area.

(7) Expansion of the Hernandez Model

Although the move to the Holland School and the expansion of this model to the Mackey Middle School will not be implemented until 1986-87, preliminary discussions have begun and will continue over the next months.

IV. DISTRICT 3 AND 4 ASSIGNMENT MODIFICATIONS

ORDER February 20, 1985

FINDINGS The implementation of the process of expanded options in Districts 3 and 4 is discussed below. In brief, the application process offered parents a number of "guaranteed" options, each of which would contribute to desegregation, and the assignment process gave priority to honoring these guarantees in such a way that as many choices were honored as possible, consistent with desegregation.

This process was discussed on a number of occasions among the parties, creating a possible precedent for future negotiations about modifications in student assignments which would be equitable and positive in their desegregation impact. (PP. 43-56)

V. BILINGUAL ASSIGNMENTS

ORDER May 10, 1975

FINDINGS Non-Compliance

The academic history, Lau (language proficiency) category, and "step" (degree

of mainstreaming) of 7,800 students in bilingual programs were reviewed. This review raised major questions about the large number of students who remain for six or more years in a program intended to teach English-language skills so as to be transitional after three years. It appears that hundreds of Hispanic students are remaining in the program without achieving mastery of English-language skills, and that many Italian (and, to a lesser extent, Greek) students are remaining in the program after acquiring such skills. The resultant equity and desegregation problems will be monitored in depth over the next months.
(PP. 57-78)

VI. CITYWIDE VOCATIONAL PROGRAM ASSIGNMENTS

ORDER September 8, 1975

FINDINGS Non-Compliance

Proposed 1985-86 assignments were not available for review during this monitoring period. The 1984-85 enrollments and retention rates and assignments for 1985-86 are reviewed below.

There is a worsening problem with enrollments at the Humphrey Center, due to the high attrition rate of all racial/ethnic groups. Programs vary in their rates of attrition. Desegregation compliance remains poor and is not improving. The Headmaster is making significant efforts to improve program quality and school climate, but only a greatly heightened commitment on Boston's part will lead to the intended enrollment levels and desegregation compliance.
(PP. 87-136)

VII. SUPPORT SERVICES FOR MINORITY STUDENTS IN EXAMINATION SCHOOLS

ORDER May 10, 1975; May 3, 1976; March 21, 1978

FINDINGS

Progress in providing the support services recommended in previous reports is reviewed below.

Monitors concentrated on four major efforts in following the progress of the examination schools to improve recruitment and support services for Black and Hispanic students:

1. Monitors re-interviewed 64 of the 135 students interviewed for Report No. 3 to determine the extent of improvements in counseling and other supports over a year. Analysis of results indicates that while all three schools continue to make progress in improving support services, more improvements are needed. In particular the availability of tutors for all students who need them was cited as a continuing problem.

2. Monitors surveyed 88 faculty members at all three examination schools for their views on causes and remedies for high Black and Hispanic attrition. In the opinion of most faculty members, poor academic preparation, poor student attitudes and motivation and a lack of effective home and community supports were the major reasons for high attrition; at Boston Technical High poor attendance and tardiness was also listed as an important cause. In addition, faculty also cited inappropriate admission standards. Among Black and a few White staff, insensitivity shown by some staff toward the problems of Black and Hispanic students was also cited as a cause for attrition. Major recommendations for improvements in reducing the attrition rate fell into these categories:

   (a) improvements in counseling, school organization and

curriculum (33.9% of total responses)

(b) increased outreach to parents (18.4% of total responses)

(c) staff training, changes, redeployment (17.5% of total responses)

(d) improve academic preparation (15.9% of total responses)

It should also be noted that twenty-one respondents provided either no recommendations for improving retention or chose not to respond at all. Although most faculty members were able to cite between one and five specific support services offered at their school (76%), many were not aware of other vital support efforts available at their school. This raises the question of how referrals to various support options can be made if faculty are not fully apprised of those options.

3. The Director of the AWC/ATS program continues to report progress in improving the quality of that preparatory program, as well as progress toward modifying the identification and selection criteria. The quality of the program, however, is still far from where it should be.

4. The results of individual written questionnaires concerning problems in support services and related issues administered to the Headmasters of all three examination schools indicate steady progress in making improvements. While the central office has provided some additional financial assistance (mostly "soft"), most efforts remain school-based. Efforts to retain needed minority staff at Boston Latin Academy, and efforts to reorganize counseling services at

Boston Latin School have each been frustrated by provisions of the union contract. (PP. 137-197)

CONCLUSIONS

1. Desegregation will be enhanced substantially if the Recruitment Incentive Plan is implemented appropriately in each of the designated schools, with policy direction and resources from the central and district offices.

2. The new approach to student assignments tested in districts 3 and 4 shows substantial promise to increase parent choices and enhance desegregation, if reinforced with recruitment efforts.

3. Preliminary review of bilingual assignments suggests that one-third of the students in middle and high school programs (nearly half of the Spanish-speaking students) have been enrolled for six or more years without mainstreaming. Next steps will include: verifying the data on-site, determining whether students are being helped to acquire English-language skills, determining whether appropriate language and other support is provided to students after mainstreaming, and reviewing the process for assignment into and out of bilingual programs.

4. Continuing review of citywide vocational enrollments reveals a worsening situation as a result of high attrition and low application rates for many programs. Neither desegregation compliance nor efficient utilization of the educational capacity has been

achieved. Planning for merger of the Humphrey Center and Madison Park High School (itself plagued by declining applications) must be a high priority, to assure that the result is improved education and attractiveness to students, as well as desegregation.

5. Continuing monitoring of support services at the examination schools reveals progress but also the need to carry through on efforts to identify and provide support to those students most in need, as well as to prepare academically-gifted Boston public school students adequately in the lower grades.

6. Progress--and the need to make more--was also observed at Burke High and the East Boston Business Magnet.

VOCATIONAL AND OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION

I. **ORDER** Unified Plan for Vocational and Occupational Education, September 8, 1975, and amended June 14, 1976 and January 28, 1978.

FINDINGS

A. RACIAL RATIOS AND ADMISSIONS CRITERIA

Partial Compliance
(See Student Assignments and Special Desegregation Measures Report) (PP. 13; 80-130)

B. CORE PROGRAMS Partial Compliance

Middle School Exploratory Clusters

The type of program offerings and length of program duration still vary across districts. There have been some reductions in staff of exploratory programs. The Tobin School remains out of compliance in the Industry Related and Food-Home-Health Services Related Clusters. Only the Cleveland and Umana schools have full time computer technology instructors. A one-week exploratory program for all 8th graders is scheduled for September 1985. (PP. 200-201)

Middle School Career Guidance

The dissemination of the Barnstable Instructional Career Exploratory Program (BICEP) career education model expanded this year to include most middle schools. A transitional package facilitating 8th

graders' choice of high schools was made available to middle school guidance counselors. The role of guidance counselors is being reassessed to expedite the implementation of the Career Development Model and Policy. (P. 201)

High School Exploratory

All high schools, except English High, offer at least 2 exploratory Industry Related Programs. There are teacher shortages in some of these programs. Each high school, except Hyde Park High offers the required 3 courses in Food-Home-Health Services. All high schools comply with required offerings in Business-Distribution-Government. HHORC enrollment is 24% exploratory. (PP. 201-202)

High School Employability Clusters

Major non-compliance still exists in the Food-Home-Health Services Cluster and Distributive Marketing Cluster. Full compliance exists in the Business Office Education Cluster. (P. 202)

C. MAGNET PROGRAMS Partial Compliance

Most of the requirements for magnet programs have been met. Among satellite programs, only West Roxbury and Dorchester High Schools have not had significant enrollment reductions. An enrollment decrease has also occurred at the HHORC, where retention is also a growing problem.

The HHORC headmaster has begun to address these enrollment problems by expanding 9th grade exploratory options. (PP. 202-204)

D. IN-SCHOOL BILINGUAL Non-Compliance (Improvement Shown)

Boston is out of compliance with the Unified Plan requirement of native language programs. Inconsistency in service delivery exists as the result of the absence of an approved bilingual vocational education policy. There is a shortage of bilingual

aides and counselors. There are no bilingual counselors at HHORC, although there are aides and limited English Proficiency (LEP) support programs. (PP. 204-206)

E. OUT OF SCHOOL YOUTH Compliance. See Report No. 4, Vol. II, pp. 190-191.

F. SPECIAL NEEDS STUDENTS Compliance. See Report No. 4, Vol. II, p. 191. PP. 207-208)

G. PROGRAM CHANGES Partial Compliance

The HHORC Cabinet-Making Program will be consolidated with the same program at Dorchester High. The East Boston High Machine Program will close at the end of the school year 1985-86, as will the Fashion Design Program at the HHORC this year. (P. 208)

If the required program transfers of Dorchester High's woodworking and architectural design programs are no longer desirable, a motion must be filed with the Court to modify the existing order.

H. PROGRAM SUPPORT COMPONENTS:

MANAGEMENT MODIFICATION Non-Compliance

Boston has not instituted a distinctive management structure for an effective vocational/occupational education. Progress has been made in:

(1) developing administrative procedures to provide the Director with firm fiscal and supervisory control;

(2) evaluating the effectiveness of all vocational/occupational programs;

(3) developing an annual accountability report for school year 1983-84. (P. 209)

PUBLIC INFORMATION Partial Compliance

While there are many public information materials about the HHORC, Vocational Education as a whole has not been adequately marketed. Many public information activities remain uncoordinated. (PP. 209, 211)

PROFESSIONAL AND IN-SERVICE DEVELOPMENT
Partial Compliance

Vocational/occupational staff at HHORC and satellite programs are in need of in-service training in instruction strategies for special needs students, linguistic strategies for LEP students, and sex equity. The logistics of scheduling citywide training for vocational teachers remains a problem. (PP. 211-212)

INDUSTRY/AGENCY COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT
Partial Compliance

Membership involvement with ACCVOE has slipped badly. There is also a lack of administrative support and of sense of purpose. (P. 212)

CURRICULUM ACQUISITION/REVISION Non-Compliance

The development of Competency-Based Vocational Education (CBVE) curricula at the HHORC is still not completed, and their effective implementation for classroom instruction is not in place. A plan for the citywide dissemination of complete CBVE curricula should be developed and implemented. (PP. 213-217)

COMPREHENSIVE JOB DEVELOPMENT Partial Compliance

There has been no change since the last report. There is still no systemwide approach for job placement. Minimal coordination exists between the staff of the Private Industry Council Collaborative and the Boston Public Schools. (PP. 214-216)

CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

In each of the following areas Boston needs to take action:

Core Programs

1. Middle School Exploratory

- establish citywide standards for Industrial Arts curricula and program implementation

2. Middle School Career Guidance

- develop an action plan for implementing the Career Development Model and Policy.

3. High School Exploratory

- offer exploratory programs at English High

- evaluate effectiveness of existing exploratory programs

4. High School Employability

- identify and extol exemplary programs which have retained students and provided job placements

- modify vocational program requirements at magnet high schools to increase citywide consistency

Magnet Programs

- follow through on the establishment of a magnet computer program at Burke High

- develop a plan for retaining students in all vocational programs

In-School Bilingual

- propose modifications to existing orders to provide bilingual support services

- have the School Committee approve the Bilingual Vocational Education Policy Paper

- implement the vocational education section of the LAU agreement

Vocational/Occupational Education for Special Needs Students

- include all vocational instructors citywide in inservice training on special needs

Program Changes and Deletions

- propose modifications to existing orders if programs are no longer desireable

Program Support

- submit annual program evaluation reports to the Massachusetts Department of Education

- centralize public information functions and provide adequate funding support

- assure that all vocational staff receive the same inservice training

- re-evaluate the operations of the Industrial/Agency Community Councils

- complete, evaluate, and distribute Competency-Based Vocational Education curricula

- review and centralize all job placement activities including those now being done through the Private Industry Council (PIC)

SCHOOL FACILITIES

I.	**ORDER**	Interlocutory Order of June 21, 1974 (prohibits construction of or changes to school facilities without Court approval).
	FINDINGS	Compliance. See Report No. 4, Vol. II, p. 205. (P.236)
II.	**ORDER**	Student Desegregation Plan, May 10, 1975, pp. 6-7 (limits size of student bodies in particular facilities and specifies which schools are to be closed).
	FINDINGS	Compliance. See Report No. 4, Vol. II, p. 205. (P. 236)
III.	**ORDER**	Memorandum and Orders Modifying Desegregation Plan, May 6, 1977, pp. 37-40.
	FINDINGS	Compliance The Unified Facilities Plan was developed in accordance with Court Orders and filed on March 25, 1985. (P. 237) On May 9, 1985, the Court gave permission for the projects identified on p. III B-2 of the Unified Facilities Plan for FY 1986 to be undertaken and authorized the parties to take all necessary steps to accomplish them.
IV.	**ORDER**	Further Memorandum and Order as to Unified Facilities Plan, August 15, 1979.
	FINDINGS	Compliance A ten year facilities plan has been filed. (P. 238)

V.	**ORDER**	Orders Relating to Unified Facilities Planning, March 21, 1980.
	FINDINGS	Compliance. See Report No. 4, Vol. II, p. 207. (P. 238)
VI.	**ORDER**	Supplemental Orders Relating to Unified Facilities Planning, April 2, 1980. (Requires closing of Mead School.)
	FINDINGS	Compliance. See Report No. 4, Vol. II, p. 208. (P. 239)
VII.	**ORDER**	Order on Joint Defendants' Motion for Adoption, May 11, 1981. (Requires closing of 27 schools.)
	FINDINGS	Compliance. See Report No. 4, Vol. II, p. 208. (P. 239)
VIII.	**ORDER**	Memorandum and Supplementary Disengagement Orders, September 17, 1984.
	FINDINGS	Compliance On March 25, 1985, a Facilities Plan was filed. (P. 239)
IX.	**ORDER**	Order to File Unified Facilities Plan, November 2, 1984
	FINDINGS	A Unified Facilities Plan was filed on March 25, 1985, in accordance with these orders. (P. 240)
X.	**ORDER**	Memorandum and Orders regarding the Unified Facilities Plan and Excess Seats - January 4, 1985.
	FINDINGS	The Joint Planners filed their calculations of excess seats and were in substantial agreement. (P. 240)
XI.	**ORDER**	Approval to proceed with first year projects in the Unified Facilities Plan - May 9, 1985.

FINDINGS

The city of Boston is processing applications for certain first-year projects. Many of these will be considered for approval at the Board of Education's June 25, 1985 meeting. (P. 240)

CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

The Board of Education now awaits the written findings of the Court with respect to the Unified Facilities Plan filed on March 25, 1985. (P. 240)

STAFF

I. **ORDER**

The desegregation of faculty and administrative staff shall be implemented according to the standards contained in the orders of July 31, 1974, et al.

FINDINGS

The percentage of Black teachers increased only 0.62%, and of other minority teachers 0.21%. The number of Black teachers increased from 870 to 922 (up 52), of other minority teachers from 351 to 386 (up 35), and of White teachers from 2951 to 3111 (up 160). The mandatory level of 20% for Black teachers has been maintained, but little progress has been made towards the goal of 25%. (PP. 393c-394; 397; 404)

Changes in administrators have been as follows:

Black principals: from 23.58% to 23.77%
Black administrators: from 23.80% to 24.21%
Other minority principals: from 4.88% to 4.92%
Other minority administrators: from 7.02% to 7.01% (PP. 393c-395; 397; 405-407)

Implementation of the new Court-approved (and simplified) promotional rating system for acting appointments has resulted in the rating of 130 department heads, pending appointments. In addition, since September 1984, 62 ratings for new vacancies have been scheduled, though only 1 appointment has been made.
(PP. 408-411; 413-417)

CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

The lack of significant increase in percentages of Black and other minority teachers is a cause for concern.

Apparently, Boston's teacher recruitment efforts have been neither extensive, aggressive, well-funded nor effective.

Boston should advertise all teacher vacancies widely in newspapers, and make strong efforts to retain current Black and other minority teachers.

Boston is to be commended for its increased use of the promotional rating system.

TRANSPORTATION

I. **ORDER** May 10, 1975, pp. 80-83

FINDINGS Partial Compliance

Monitors have not had a response from Boston relative to concerns raised in previous reports about a lack of strong management controls over transportation standards and procedures. In particular, Boston has not described how it will resolve problems related to lack of adequate follow-up on complaints filed with the transportation department. Continuing stories in the pess regarding incompetence, criminal records and malfeasance among some school bus drivers, and other safety concerns further emphasize the need for stronger management controls and a system of contractor and school bus driver accountability. (P. 421c)

CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

Boston should develop and implement standards and procedures to ensure consistent, high quality transportation service. (P. 422)

II. **SCHOOL BUS SAFETY**

Monitors have continued to follow the progress of the school bus safety plan implemented in September. Evaluations conducted by the Department of Safety Services and the Citywide Parents Council this spring provide strong evidence that the new program is a success, with Boston reporting a 70% drop in reported incidents on school buses since September (90% drop on those buses with attendants). The

addition of school bus attendants has been the key to the success of the plan. The only major complaint coming from the respondents to the Safety Department evaluation is a desire to see school bus attendants on all school buses rather than the few who are currently assigned according to a formula. (P. 422)

PARENT AND STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS

PARENT ORGANIZATIONS

I.	**ORDER**	Memorandum and Orders Establishing Racial Parent Councils, October 4, 1974, and subsequent modifying orders.
	FINDINGS	Partial Compliance Further modifications in the structure and purposes of the councils are necessary to insure parent participation, to redefine the council's desegregation monitoring responsibilities and to guarantee parent participation in decision-making and planning. (P. 458)
II.	**ORDER**	Order of May 10, 1975 mandating the establishment of a Citywide Coordinating Council.
	FINDINGS	Compliance. See Report No. 4, Vol. II, p. 468. (P. 459)
III.	**ORDER**	Supplemental Order of November 8, 1976, concerning the role of the School Committee in citizen participation groups.
	FINDINGS	Compliance. See Report No. 4, Vol. II, p. 469. (P. 459)
IV.	**ORDER**	Memorandum and Further Orders of September 1, 1977 concerning organizational relations among the Citywide Parents Advisory Council, the Community District Parent Advisory Councils and the Racial Ethnic Parent Councils (P. 459)

FINDINGS Compliance. See Report No. 4, Vol. II, p. 469.

V. **ORDER** Memorandum and Further Orders of September 15, 1978 clarifying the responsibilities of the various citizen participation groups as well as certain procedural matters.

FINDINGS Compliance. See Report No. 4, Vol. II, p. 470. (P. 459)

VI. **ORDER** Order of May 8, 1980 establishing procedural guidelines for monitoring school desegregation.

FINDINGS Partial Compliance

Procedural guidelines need to be reviewed and modified. (PP. 459-460)

VII. **ORDER** Memorandum and Semi-Final Orders reorganizing the parent participation councils to increase their effectiveness.

FINDINGS Partial Compliance

During the past six months there has been improvement in (1) levels of parent participation in SPC's, (2) tensions between the CPC and the school department, and (3) the organizational problems with the CPC. (PP. 460-461)

VIII. **ORDER** Memorandum and Further Orders completing the restructuring of the parent councils.

FINDINGS Partial Compliance

CPC's monitoring responsibilities need to be reviewed and modified. The issue of parent participation in the screening of applicants for administrative positions has been resolved. (PP. 461-462)

CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Strong efforts are still needed to develop duly constituted, effective

SPCs as mandated by Court Order. Low parent turn-out, and absenteeism among elected officers impede the functions of some SPCs. CPC candidates should have at least a year's involvement with the SPC before they can serve as CPC members.

2. The parent councils should be retained as organizations independent of the school department, and Boston should make it clear that the CPC-SPC is the only legitimate parent organization responsible for parent involvement in the implementation of court orders, legislation, and/or collective bargaining. CPC should work with other parent groups for the benefit of all students.

3. The Court should narrow the CPC's monitoring responsibilities to include only the areas of transportation, screening and rating of staff, collective bargaining, maintenance of buildings, and student recruitment efforts in special desegregation schools and/or schools named in special court orders.

4. Boston and the CPC should agree to a procedure for determining furture funding levels for the CPC.

5. All CPC reports and other findings should be available to all parties in the Boston desegregation case as well as all parents in the system. CPC should publish an annual report on all of its activities. (PP. 464-465)

Recent reports of internal discord within the CPC suggests the need for continuing strong efforts to stabilize the CPC so that internal disputes do not impede the important functions of the organization as a whole.

STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS

I. **ORDER** Memorandum and Order of October 4, 1974 establishing racial ethnic student councils in every middle and high school.

FINDINGS Non-Compliance

Only the Thompson Middle School had a functioning RESC. The councils received little, if any, school department aid. The suggestion to replace RESC's with Communications Boards has been without support. (PP. 467-468)

II. **ORDER** Amalgamation Plan, which established the system's student government organizations, and made the Racial Ethnic Student Councils subcommittees of racially representative student council.

FINDINGS Partial Compliance

Thirteen schools did not submit timely election data to the Student Affairs Office this school year. No data has been submitted on the election of RESC's or student representatives to SPC's. (PP. 468-469)

CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

Boston must develop a policy with respect to RESC's or Communication Boards including a procedure, timeline and funding for their implementation. Middle and high schools must submit yearly election data on student councils by November 1 of each school year. Finally, student participation on high school School Site Councils should be encouraged and insured. (PP. 469-470)

DISPUTE RESOLUTIONS

Only one dispute reached the level of request for State Board mediation described at section V(D)(1) of the Orders of Disengagement. This dispute concerned permanent appointments for certain members of the Department of Implementation, and was resolved informally between the Boston Teachers Union and the School Department prior to the actual commencement of the mediation process.

Complaints raised by Plaintiff-intervenors, which had previously been the subject of Dispute Resolution at the School Department level, continued to be addressed by the concerned parties without a request for State Board mediation. At a hearing held on May 13, 1985, counsel for El Comite informed the Court that School Defendants had promised a response on these outstanding issues within the week.

MODIFICATIONS

Extensive negotiations among the parties were conducted during this monitoring period, relating to a variety of Court Orders. The State Board, through its counsel and the Associate Commissioner for Occupational Education, initiated a series of discussions regarding revision of the Unified plan for Vocational and Occupational Education. As of June 1, these discussions were still being conducted, though the State Board hoped to be able to present its recommendations to the Court in June. The State Board also authorized counsel to begin a series of negotiations regarding various modifications of student assignment orders. The first four meetings in this series of negotiations were held on May 8, May 13, May 23, and May 31, and covered School Defendants' proposed consolidation of Districts III and IV, and Plaintiffs' request for modification of orders relating to the Examination Schools.

In addition to the above negotiations, which have been conducted in accordance with Section VI of the Orders of Disengagement, School Defendants, City Defendants and the State Board held lengthy negotiations prior to the joint filing of the Unified Facilities Plan.